DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 772 HE 033 991

AUTHOR	Johnson, Kirk; Inoue, Yukiko
TITLE	From Theory to Practice: An Analysis of Multicultural Education in an American Pacific Island University.
PUB DATE	2001-06-00
NOTE	30p.; Paper presented at the Asian Studies on the Pacific Coast Conference (Monterey, CA, June 8-10, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Asian Americans; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; *Pacific Americans; Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Guam

ABSTRACT

This study explored multicultural education at a minority university in the Pacific, the University of Guam. The study represented Phase 2 of a research project that began in 1999 with the goal of further understanding the practice of multicultural pedagogy in higher education. Phase 1 measured the attitudes and perceptions of faculty members toward diversity and multiculturalism, while Phase 2 attempted to narrow the focus to the actual practice of multiculturalism in the classroom and curriculum. Through a survey completed by 65 faculty members (33% of the faculty) and descriptive analysis, a picture emerged of the link between perception and actual practice. It was found that faculty ranked high on their willingness to engage and incorporate multicultural strategies in their teaching. Many often did not feel, however, that they had the skills or knowledge to do so. Many also felt that they were not well equipped to deal with a multicultural environment. While the data suggest that many are willing and open to diversity and multiculturalism, the faculty harbor ethnocentric belief systems. It is argued that what seems like contradiction, is more likely to be the leaking of underlying attitudes and beliefs in an environment influenced by political correctness. (Contains 7 tables and 31 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 772

From Theory to Practice: An Analysis of Multicultural Education in an American Pacific Island University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Y. Inoue

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kirk Johnson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
College of Arts and Sciences, University of Guam
UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 96923
E-mail: kjohnson@og.edu

Yukiko Inoue, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Educational Research
College of Education, University of Guam
UOG Station, Mangilao, Guam 96923
Phone: 1-671-735-2447 Fax: 1-671-734-3651
E-mail: yinoue@uog.edu

Paper presented at Asian Studies on the Pacific Coast (ASPC) Conference, Monterey, CA, June 8-10, 2001.

HE033991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From Theory to Practice: An Analysis of Multicultural Education in an American Pacific Island University

Kirk Johnson & Yukiko Inoue, University of Guam

Abstract

This paper explored multicultural education at a minority university in the Pacific. This was Phase II of a research project that began in 1999 with the goal of further understanding the practice of multicultural pedagogy in higher education. Phase I measured the attitudes and perceptions of faculty toward diversity and multiculturalism while Phase II attempted to narrow the focus to the actual practice of multiculturalism in the classroom and curriculum. Through survey methodology and descriptive analysis, a picture emerged of the link between perception and actual practice. It was found that faculty ranked high on their willingness to engage and incorporate multicultural strategies in their teaching. Many often did not feel, however, that they had the skills or knowledge to do so. Many also felt that they were not well equipped to deal with a multicultural environment. While the data suggests that many are willing and open to diversity and multiculturalism, they harbor ethnocentric belief systems. It is argued that what seems like contradictions are more likely the leaking of the underlying attitudes and beliefs within an environment influenced by political correctness.

From Theory to Practice: An Analysis of Multicultural Education in an American Pacific Island University

Kirk Johnson & Yukiko Inoue, University of Guam

Many believe that multicultural education must be central to any discourse on pedagogical philosophy and practice (Cooper & Chattergy, 2000; Saito & Oh, 2000). In our attempt to advance the process of human development, and in our goal of raising better informed, balanced, insightful, and compassionate individuals, the educational establishment (both primary and post secondary) has proposed and has experimented with a variety of multicultural pedagogies for many years. This trend was first initiated to combat head-on the social and cultural diversities of the modern world and to prepare our children for an ever-increasing multicultural social reality. There is consensus that quality education in the arts and sciences must be an important priority, but the debates surrounding the methods by which we achieve this have been contested. The growing awareness of the diversity of the modern world has created anxiety for some while evoking hope among others. The opposition to the idea of incorporating pedagogic approaches that address the issues of diversity and multiculturalism within America's educational institutions ranges from claims based on ideological differences to exaggerated fears of the resulting divisiveness (Griffin, 2000; Sleeter, 1995).

In this paper, we analyze the theory and practice of multiculturalism in higher education in Guam. In doing so, we explore the experiences of faculty in incorporating multicultural pedagogic strategies at an American Pacific Island University. By encouraging faculty members to examine their own instructional activities as they relate to multiculturalism, we hoped to raise faculty awareness of the realities of diversity, especially at a minority university. In other words, we hoped that faculty members take a step back from their daily busy activities and objectively

analyze their own initiatives in addressing the needs of our culturally diverse student body. We were particularly interested in understanding the relationship between perceptions of and attitudes toward multicultural education and actual pedagogic practice in teaching. We hoped to discover if theory is translated into practice in the classroom.

Review of the Literature

There exists great concern among post-modernists and others that in our efforts to celebrate diversity and incorporate pedagogic strategies that address those differences we have morally paralyzed our teachers (Applebaum, 1996). The argument is such that by:

> Acknowledging the legitimacy of other voices and understanding how they have been silenced by the presumed superiority of western values and standards may constitute a most devastating assault on those values and standards. Avoiding the charge of ethnocentrism may imply not so much heralding other voices as much as stifling our own and may lead to a pernicious form of moral paralysis. (Applebaum, 1996, p. 185)

At one level, efforts to address diversity in higher education have centered on recruiting more students and faculty that represent the diversity of the larger community. Though an admirable step, it has become clear that these efforts are insufficient on their own. Educators are faced with the pressing concern that they must support, encourage, and respond to the cultural needs of those individuals in order that they prosper and succeed academically. It is no longer sufficient for a university to demonstrate that it has achieved a balance by recruiting and admitting a certain number of Asians or Pacific Island students. The test rests on their efforts to respond to these students' diverse needs and see them through their educational experience allowing them to achieve their full potential.

If our institutions of higher learning are to be leaders in cultural diversity and educational thought, "they must raise the awareness of their faculties to the increasingly multicultural nature of the students they face and the resulting consequences" (Cooper & Chattergy, 1998, p. 125). Higher education faculty members must be leaders in the field of multicultural education. Faculty members must not only be proponents but also be practitioners. It is one thing to believe in something or agree with the necessity for its implementation, and it is another to be an active supporter and "doer." As Gaff (1992) poignantly puts it, "in order for professors to become a part of the solution and not the problem, they need to examine their own views and emotional roots" (p. 31). Faculty must understand that their role in the educational experience is a weighty one. Thus, if they are to begin to understand the "complexity of their own experiences due to cultural influences and realize that they negotiate cultural complexity in their own lives, they can bring increasing awareness and cultural sensitivity to their instructional activities and their interactions with students" (Cooper & Chattergy, 1998, p. 125).

Multiculturalism Explored

There are numerous ways by which we might attempt to understand the concept of multiculturalism, and many have tried to do just that. Some explore the historical context within which the concept has developed (Banks, 1995), or strategies for its implementation (Lynn, 1998). We might want to understand its goals or analyze its content. Whatever the approach we use, it is essential that the fundamental elements of the concept be outlined and delineated. Most literature focusing on diversity and multicultural education pays primary attention to the issues of curriculum and pedagogy (Prince & Valli, 1998) and these are probably the most prominent areas of reform in the multicultural education discourse (Fox & Gay, 1995).

Gollnick and Chinn (1998) noted the six goals of multicultural education: (1) to promote the value of cultural diversity; (2) to promote human rights and respect for those who are different from oneself; (3) to acquire knowledge of the historical and social realities of a society in order to better understand the existing inequalities of racism, sexism, and poverty; (4) to tolerate people's alternative life choices; (5) to promote social justice, and equality; and (6) to promote equity in the distribution of power and income among diverse ethnic groups. Although these goals seem praiseworthy, the reality is that many come to the classroom with limited interracial and intercultural real-life experiences (Melnick & Zeichner, 1998). Most are "unaware of the formidable educational challenges presented by the changing linguistic and ethnic composition of our classroom environments" (Wilhelm, Cowart, Hume, & Rademacher, 1996). While some argue that our preoccupation with diversity has resulted in a decrease in academic standards and a general decline in curriculum (Griffin, 2000), some argue that this catering to diversity has resulted in isolation instead of unity (D'Souza, 1991). Our emphasis on multiculturalism highlights what separates people, rather than building upon our similarities (Griffin, 2000). The unifying vision of people coming together from varied nations, especially in America is giving way to group separatism and the Tower of Babel (Schlesinger, 1992).

Whatever the criticisms may be, and there is no shortage of them, our position is based on the fundamental belief that our classrooms are diverse spheres of social life and to ignore the diversity is to overlook the multicultural nature of the educational experience of our students. This creates an environment and a curriculum that is devoid of any real knowledge or experience. Learning then takes place in a vacuum and knowledge is far removed from real life experience. Multicultural education is recognition that while standards must remain high, it demands that educators must work to create an atmosphere and a curriculum that allows learners

to achieve their full capacity. Our task is to recognize that our students come from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and that we as educators must work within that paradigm. A number of scholars (e.g., Dennan-sparks, 1989; Gay, 1995; Gollnick & Chinn, 1988; Kiger & Byrnes, 1992; Ogbu, 1992) agree that our approach to multicultural education must be founded on respect, acceptance, understanding, and an appreciation of others. We should recognize that we all harbor stereotypes, and until we develop positive personal attitudes and perceptions our efforts as educators in multicultural curriculum will remain fruitless (Derman-Sparks, 1989).

In our efforts to produce curriculum that addresses the diversity of the needs of our students and is inclusive of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and social class, we must moreover center our energies on highlighting those norms and values that are universal in nature. Consequently, one might speak to the diversity of religion in society or ethnicity and the complexities that are inherent therein, but go beyond that recognition to an appreciation of such universal values as respect, honesty, kindness, determination, caring, responsibility, trustworthiness, generosity, creativity, compassion, courtesy, courage, perseverance, or forgiveness to name just a few. Multicultural education is indeed a complex concept, and a variety of views exist in relation to its content and methods of implementation. What is most important in our view, however, is that the bedrock upon which the foundation of multicultural education is poured must be the recognition of universal human values.

Ethnocentrism Explored

The concept of ethnocentrism is yet another term that requires some analysis. This concept is central to multicultural education in that by understanding not only what it means in everyday life, but also how we as educators not only harbor ethnocentric attitudes and often instill those attitudes and beliefs in our students. In the process of socialization, one begins to see the world

and oneself through the prism of his or her cultural context. Gollnick and Chinn (1998), writing about ethnocentrism, explicate:

> Because culture helps determine the way we think, feel, and act, it becomes the lens through which we judge the world. It can become an unconscious blinder to other ways of thinking, feeling and acting. Our own culture is automatically treated as innate. It becomes the only natural way to function in the world. Even common sense in our own culture is naturally translated to common sense for the world. The rest of the world is viewed through our cultural lens. Other cultures are compared with ours and evaluated by our cultural standards. (p. 13)

Yet, as Applebaum (1996) points out, such ethnocentrism is not necessarily a problem until one makes a moral judgment about someone else or some other culture on the basis of such beliefs and standards. It is here that Gramsci's (1971) idea of power and hegemony is so important. It is not so much the origin of a person's beliefs but the power and dominance bestowed on those beliefs that are significant to an understanding of ethnocentrism. In Applebaum's (1996) words:

> It is not only beliefs and feelings of superiority that define this sense of ethnocentrism but, rather, the power that one group has to define standards and values in such a way as to ignore and suppress those who have opposing views. It is the dominance and not merely the presumed superiority that characterizes this sense of ethnocentrism. (pp. 187-8)

Theoretical Framework

There are different ways in which we might approach the concept of culture to better understand its dimensions and implications for multicultural education. As Ellen (1984) points out, the notion of culture:

> Stems directly from the idea that the social world is not a real objective world external to man in the same sense as many other objectively existing realities (natural world) but is a world constituted by meaning. It does not exist independently of the social meanings that its members use to account for it and, hence to constitute it. Social facts are thus not things, which can be simply observed. (p. 28)

It is not only behavior, customs, objects, and emotions that are important but also their meaning in the real world. As researchers we observe behavior, but we go beyond it to inquire about the meaning of that behavior. We see artifacts and natural objects but go beyond them to discover what meanings people assign to these objects. We observe and record emotional states, but go beyond them to discover the meaning of fear, anxiety, anger, joy, and love (Spradley, 1979, p. 6). Yet we recognize that behavior, customs, and a people's general way of living can be interpreted and described from more than one perspective. That is why the exploration of culture as a concept in the political as well as the social realms is so important.

At a certain level, "the culture concept comes down to behavior patterns associated with particular groups of people that is to 'customs', or to a people's way of life" (Harris, 1968, p. 16). However, this understanding blurs the critical distinction between the outsider and insider's points of view. Members of two different groups (or cultural contexts) might observe the same event or behavior with completely different interpretations. We use our own cultural experience to interpret the world around us, what we hear, see, feel and taste. According to Spradley (1979), "Culture... refers to the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior" (p. 5). Schein (1985) defines cultures as:

> A pattern of basic assumptions—invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has

> worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 385)

Therefore, it is the individual's interpretations and assumptions about social life that are most fundamental to behavior. It is cultural norms and assumptions then that dictate the use of time, space, and communication particularly in university settings among both students and faculty (Copper & Chattergy, 1998), which influences behavior both in and out of the classroom (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988). An "awareness of these issues can enhance the ability of faculty members to adjust to the multicultural demands made both in the classroom and within their departments" (Copper & Chettergy, 1998, p. 126). Many assume that faculty within the university environment understand the importance of infusing their curricula with cultural diversity concepts and approaches (Flannery & Vanterpool, 1990). Yet we must understand that recognition and implementation are not synonymous. Attitudes and beliefs about something do not necessarily translate to action. The belief that multicultural education is important to a university education experience and implementing and infusing the curricula with cultural diversity concepts do not always go together. "Like their students, faculty members are receptive or resistant to including concepts of cultural diversity in their classrooms in varying degrees across different disciplines" (Cooper and Chattergy, 1998, p. 127).

The Setting

Guam is a unique island in the Pacific situated between east and west. With a population of 155,000 and a cultural and ethnic diversity that rivals any other region of the Pacific. Guam draws its strength from the indigenous people as well as the immigrants from Asia, Europe, America, and throughout the Pacific (see Table 1 for ethnic composition of Guam 1920-1990). Guam is a frontier border between Asia and America where peoples, politics, and economies of

their countries have met and have mixed and where global immigrations have met domestic migrations (Nomura, 1996). Like the social fabric of Guam, the University of Guam (UOG) is also a culturally diverse and rich environment. Recognized as a minority institution of higher learning by the U.S. Department of Education, UOG is by far the most diverse university campus within the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. According to Manuel Esteban, president of California State University at Chico and co-chair of the WASC accreditation team that visited UOG in 2000:

> People in the mainland talk about diversity, and most struggles just to get a student body that is representative of a region. But here you have an exceptionally diverse population, both in terms of the students, the faculty, and the administration. (News, 2000, p. 2)

It is for this reason that the discourse surrounding multiculturalism at this particular university is so critical.

<Table 1 about here>

Purpose of the Study

This study is Phase II of a research project that began in 1999 with the aim of understanding multicultural education more fully as it relates to the unique context of UOG. Phase I (1999) included a survey of faculty on their attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and multiculturalism and our present research attempts to explore the actual practices of faculty in responding to the diverse nature of their classrooms. Our primary goal in the present study is to understand the extent to which faculty infuse their own curricula and instruction with culturally diverse concepts and strategies and the methods they employ in responding to the multicultural nature of their classroom environments. An underlying question was to explore the link (by comparing the results of Phase I with this study) between perceptions and practice. Further, an

attempt was made to understand the relationship between attitudes toward diversity in higher education and faculty's pedagogic strategies to address the multicultural realities of their classrooms. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, specific hypotheses were not established.

Method

Participants

With the permission of the UOG's Human Resources Office, a survey questionnaire was mailed to each of the 198 full-time faculty members during the spring semester of 2000. The intended population of the study was the entire full-time faculty in all five colleges (Agriculture and Life Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business and Public Administration, Education, and Nursing and health Science) at UOG. The usable return rate was 33% (N = 65). Table 2 shows the demographic information of the participants. Although females were much more cooperative in responding to the previous questionnaire than were males, this time the return rate was almost the same for both genders: about 60% of the faculty were male (32% returned) and 40% were female (34% returned). The largest ethnic group among the faculty that responded to the survey was from a Caucasian background (48%), which was expected because 60% of the entire faculty were Caucasians. The next largest group was Chamorro comprising 23% of the participants. Asians made up 5%, and Filipino represented 6%. The sample represented a relatively old group of the faculty with 40% between the ages of 46 to 55 (in fact, 69% of the participants were 46 years or older). About 75% of the faculty had a doctorate, 22% a master's degree, and 3% a baccalaureate or less. Teaching experience varied considerably with 11% having five or fewer years of classroom teaching, and 25% having more than 21 years.

< Table 2 about here >

Questionnaire

The questionnaire, consisting of 26 questions in three sections, was developed, piloted, and examined for content validity and reliability by a panel of the faculty. The first section asked the participants to rate each of the 17 questions (such as "How often do you accommodate different viewpoints of your students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background?") on a five-point scale (5 = very frequently, 4 = frequently, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = very seldom). In addition, one question ("Do you evaluate attitudes and behaviors of other cultural/ethnic groups from your own cultural/ethnic standard?") asked on a Likert-type scale from 1 = never to 5 = always. The second section was divided into three parts measuring (1) the faculty's practice of multiculturalism in teaching (e.g., how often the faculty selected a textbook based on multicultural perspectives), (2) the avenues that the faculty choose to enhance their knowledge about multiculturalism, and (3) the faculty's open-ended comments on the state of multicultural education at UOG. Finally, the third section contained five demographic question items, such as gender, age, ethnic background, academic degree, and years of teaching. Descriptive statistics reported in this paper were based on the data from the 65 respondents.

Results

Diversity in Education

The faculty answered questions, such as "How often do you try to get every student involved in a class discussion?" As seen in Table 3, the five "very frequently" occurring questions were: (1) "support the academic success of your students regardless of their culture and ethnic background" (52 participants), (2) "have high expectation for your students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background" (43), (3) "listen to your students interactively and attentively regardless of their cultural/ethnic background" (43), (4) "attempt to eradicate

prejudice and stereotypes that your students may have" (41), and (5) "get every students involved in a class discussion" (35). The overall mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) for all the respondents by each of the questions were calculated and then arranged in descending order (see Table 4). The reliability coefficient alpha across the 17 questions was .87. The following five questions had the highest mean scores: (1) "to support the academic success of the students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background" (M = 4.71, SD = .76), (2) "to have higher expectation for the students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background" (M = 4.54, SD = .79), (3) "to listen to the students interactively and attentively regardless of their cultural and ethnic background" (M = 4.49, SD = .90), (4) "to attempt to eradicate prejudice and stereotypes that your students may have" (M = 4.46, SD = .87), and (5) "to accommodate cultural and ethnic differences of the students in the classroom" (M = 4.45, SD = .78).

< Tables 3 and 4 about here >

Multiculturalism in the Classroom

Table 5 illustrates how often faculty had engaged in activities related to multiculturalism in the past year. In those cases of "11 times or more," the results were as follows: "open discussion to allow students to share their own views and opinions" (59%), "enhancing the syllabus to address diversity and multiculturalism" (14%), "brainstorming approach with the students about their needs and wants" (12%), "selection and use of appropriate textbooks" (9%), "inviting other colleagues as guest lecturers to offer the students different perspectives" (2%), and "inviting your colleagues to observe your teaching and to offer feedback" (2%).

< Table 5 about here >

Multicultural Experience

When the participants were asked in what ways they had expanded or had enhanced their

knowledge and awareness about issues of multiculturalism and diversity, as seen in Table 6, most acknowledged that they "choose to associate and learn from people (outside of academia) from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds" (94%), and "by visiting and traveling to other places (that is, exposing oneself to other cultures in Micronesia, the Pacific and Asia)" (91%). While several said that they "turn to television, journals, and books in their search for knowledge and understanding" (88%), others choose to "attend lectures, conferences, and workshops on topics that may contribute to their knowledge of other cultures" (82%). Some faculty "collaborate in research" (74%) and even fewer "collaborate in teaching" (69%) with colleagues from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. This study has revealed that the respondents tend to evaluate attitudes and behaviors of other cultural and ethnic groups from their own cultural and ethnic standard (see Table 7): usually (29%), and sometimes (39%).

< Tables 6 and 7 About Here >

Discussion and Implications

The premise upon which this research was based rests on the philosophy that multicultural education enriches the learning process. Addressing the diversity of needs and cultures in our classrooms must, we believe, work as a framework within which all learning takes place. A minority university in the Pacific was used as a case study to analyze teaching practices and then to relate these findings to their initial perceptions of diversity and multiculturalism. Our goal was to understand the relationship between attitudes and practice. In other words, we hoped to explore the bridge between what people say they believe and what they actually practice.

Perceptions of Multiculturalism – Phase I

All the UOG faculty members were surveyed measuring their *perceptions* of diversity and multiculturalism (Inoue & Jonson, 1999). The findings of this research indicate a high level of

interest and desire on the part of faculty to address and incorporate pedagogic strategies in their teaching that acknowledges diversity and multiculturalism. In particular:

> The initial review of the results indicated that relatively more women were responding to the survey than were men, the statistical analysis did not particularly support the previous research that argued that female instructors were far more likely than male instructors to bring diversity issues into the classroom and that as minorities in all societies with unequal access to resources of power, women are more likely to recognize the importance of providing a truly pluralistic educational environment. (Inoue & Johnson, 1999, pp. 10-11)

In addition, about 95% of the respondents in this initial study supported the concept of pluralism (cultural and ethnic diversity is an asset that enriches the learning process) in education. Therefore, as far as the perceptions of faculty toward diversity and multiculturalism in a higher education learning environment, the results of the Phase I of this research were very encouraging. The most obvious next step to this research was to explore whether in fact these perceptions and attitudes were reflected in the pedagogic practices of faculty in the classroom. In the first survey, we asked such questions as "How important is it for you to provide an environment for the free and open expression of ideas and beliefs?" or "How important is it for you to use culturally relevant examples in teaching?" Therefore, it was clear that in Phase II more specific questions needed to be asked compelling the respondent to truly ponder their own actions: "How often do you accommodate different learning styles of your students regardless of their cultural/ethnic backgrounds?" or "How many times in the past year have you allowed open discussion to allow students to share their own views and opinions?" or "How many times in the past year have you enhanced your syllabus to address diversity and multiculturalism?" In approaching the subject from this angle not only does the relationship between what faculty say

and what they do become more clear, but also the level at which faculty incorporate multicultural pedagogy in the classroom is evidenced.

Multicultural Pedagogy – Phase II

In Phase II of this research not as many faculty responded to the survey compared to the first (Phase I = 51%; Phase II = 32%). This was predicted due to the fact that the questions asked in this survey compelled the respondents to engage in more soul searching than the first. It is one thing to ask faculty if they think it is important to integrate multicultural perspectives in teaching, to challenge and avoid using stereotypes in teaching, or to collaborate on research and teaching with colleagues from the same cultural and ethnic backgrounds. It is a very different thing to ask those same faculty one year later to respond to such questions that are designed to measure how often they in fact do these things – how often do you use culturally relevant or responsive textbooks in teaching, how often do you collaborative/collegial partnership with colleagues from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds, or how often do you provide students with multicultural instructional materials. With more soul searching, one might come to the conclusion that in fact one is not as multicultural as one thought. One may believe that addressing the diverse needs of students is important but how many faculty actually search out text books that address that need. Finally, there were no significant differences between faculty on gender, experience, or ethnicity and their practice of multiculturalism in the classroom.

Multicultural Pedagogy

The results indicate that the faculty who responded to the survey ranked high on most indicators. This is a hopeful finding especially given the fact that UOG is a minority university and is comprised of a diversity of cultures, languages and thus worldviews. The one area that the faculty ranked relatively low was on the subject of inviting guest lecturers to their classes and

inviting colleagues to observe and offer critical feedback. This is not surprising given the individualistic nature of the culture of higher education where it is rare to find faculty collaborating on a regular basis in research and in teaching. Academics are trained as individuals and thus learn to perform as individuals.

Some interesting findings should be highlighted in Table 3. Questions 9 and 13 raise interesting problems. Question 9 asked, "How often do you integrate multicultural perspectives in teaching?" and faculty ranked relatively high (about 80% of the respondents answered "very frequently" and "frequently"). However, when asked a similar question with a slight change in the specific focus (Q13: How often do you provide your students with multicultural instructional materials) respondents who answered in the affirmative dropped to 56%. This draws our attention to the subtle difference between the two questions. One was referring to multicultural perspectives and the other was referring to instructional materials. Only 24% of the respondents rarely incorporate multicultural instructional materials in their teaching. This is understandable when one considers how faculty in higher education are trained to be teachers and facilitators of learning. Grade school teachers have more training in the art of instruction than the most knowledgeable and published Ph.D. teaching at the university level. Faculty in higher education might have good intentions and might attempt to relate to student perspectives of a multicultural nature, but they have never been trained to incorporate multicultural pedagogic strategies into teaching. This is a major deficit in higher education in America and this finding lends credence to the call for faculty to receive education not only in content but also in process.

Ethnocentrism

Our second research question attempted to explore the level of ethnocentrism in the classroom. A standard sociology text book offers this definition of ethnocentrism: "the use of

one's own culture as a yardstick for judging the ways of other individuals or societies, generally leading to a negative evaluation of their values, norms and behaviors" (Henslin, 1997, p. 36). Our initial analysis of the data gave us hope. Our sample of UOG faculty ranked high on most questions regarding their approach to multicultural education and addressing the diversity needs of students. Faculty make efforts in selecting appropriate textbooks, enhance syllabi, incorporate students comments into their teaching plans, open discussion encouraging students to participate, inviting colleagues to guest lecture or to observe and offer feedback (see Table 5). These data are promising and encouraging. However, on the question, "Do you evaluate attitudes and behaviors of other cultural/ethnic groups from your own cultural/ethnic standards?" (see Table 7) a surprisingly high number of faculty answered in the affirmative. Almost 29% of our sample answered that they "usually" do this. Only 31% of those were women and the rest were men. A total of 39% of the respondents answered that they "sometimes" do this. Ethnocentrism can have severe negative consequences. It can lead to harmful discrimination and unfair treatment toward people whose beliefs, values, and behaviors are different from our own. This is unsettling especially in a classroom environment where 60% of the faculty belong to one culture or ethnicity and 92% of the students to another.

The paradigm or the *Zeitgeist* of the postmodern world centers on the notion of political correctness. The spirit of the times calls us to speak and to behave in ways that might not represent our true feelings or attitudes. The faculty surveyed ranked high on most indicators but the item exploring their ethnocentric attitudes and approaches to the learning environment (see Table 7) do not seem to fit. What seems like contradictions, however, are more likely the leaking of the underlying attitudes and beliefs of this sample group. University faculty members are probably the one group that is most aware of and cognizant of what they say and how they say it.

This educated segment of the population does appear to want to incorporate multicultural pedagogy into their teaching and many do. However, the underlying ethnocentric attitudes that we as members of society all share to varying degrees raises great concerns, especially when harbored by those who are so involved in educating and shaping the minds and lives of our next generation of leaders and policy makers.

Directions for Future Research

The findings raise several questions about the nature of what people say and what they do. We believe in the value of multicultural education as a transformative agent and we as educators must teach our students to respect – rather than reject or merely tolerate – difference. The UOG faculty are doing just that and should be commended on not only their perceptions and attitudes, but their pedagogic practices in the classroom that are filled with students that reflect the diversity of our Pacific region and indeed the world. Nevertheless, the underlying cultural and attitudinal nature of our ethnocentric world is one that must be addressed at deeper levels. To believe in pluralism and to work toward addressing diversity in the classroom is commendable, but one must also evaluate one's own cultural as well as social-psychological attitudes in the process. An important question raised through the course of this study deals with the idea of the uniqueness of UOG faculty. How valid are these findings. If we replicate this study at a similar size university in the mid-west, will we discover similar results? To answer this question, we have chosen a small university in the mid-west, mostly Caucasian and mostly homogeneous in terms of culture and language, to replicate this study. Our findings will be forthcoming.

References

Applebaum, B. (1996). Moral paralysis and the ethnocentric fallacy. *Journal of Moral Education 25*, 185-199.

Banks, J. (1995). Multicultural education: historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Chaffee, E., & Tierney, W. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: Macmillan.

Cooper, J., & Chattergy, V. (1998). Crossing cultural borders: Faculty look into roles and expectations. In R. Endo et al. (Eds.), *Current issues in Asian and Pacific American education* (pp. 125-141). South El Monte: Pacific Asia Press.

Derman-Sparks, L. (1989). *Anti-bias curriculum*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

D'Souza, D. 1991. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: The Free Press.

Ellen, R.F. (1984). *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct*. London: Academic Press.

Flannery, B. & Vanterpool, M. (1990). A model for infusing cultural diversity concepts across the curriculum. *To Improve the Academy 10*, 159-175.

Fox, W. & Gay, G. (1995). Integrating multicultural and curriculum principles in teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education 70*(3), 64-82.

Gaff, J. 1992. Beyond Politics: The education issues inherent in Multicultural Education. *Change 24*(1) p. 30-36.

Gay, G. (1995). Curriculum Theory and Multicultural Education. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan.

Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (1998). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. Columbus: Merrill.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Griffin, M. (2000). *What is Diversity?* Paper presented at the College of Arts and Sciences Research Conference, University of Guam. April 27, 2000.

Harris, M. (1968). *The rise of anthropological theory*. New York: Crowell.

Henslin, J. (1997). *Sociology: A down to earth approach.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Inoue, Y., & Johnson, K. (2000). *Faculty attitudes toward diversity and multiculturalism in higher education.* Paper presented at the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education Conference, Kailua-Kona, Hawaii, (April 11-15).

Kiger, G., & Byrnes, D. (1992). Introduction. In D. Byrenes & G. Kinger (Eds.) *Common bonds: Anti-bias teaching in a diverse society.* Wheaton, MD: Association for Childhood Education International.

Lynn, M. (1998). Teaching though diversity. *College Teaching 46*(4), 123-27.

Melnick, S.L., & Zeichner, K.M. (1998). Teacher education's responsibility to address diversity issues: Enhancing institutional capacity. *Theory into Practice 37*(2), 88-94.

Nomura, G. M. (1996). Asian American frontiers. *Frontiers, 17*(3), 12-13.

Ogbu, J. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and teaching. *Educational Researcher, 21*(8), 514.

Price, J., & Valli, L. (1998). Institutional support for diversity in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 37*(2), 114-120.

Saito, N., & Oh, D. (2000). *Beyond multicultural education.* Paper presented at the 22nd Annual NAAPAE Conference, Kailua, Hawaii (April 10-14).

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlesinger, A. (1992). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Schwab, G. J. (1988). *Ethnicities and masculinities in the making: A challenge for social work on Guam.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Sleeter, C. (1995). An analysis of the critiques of multicultural education. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook on Multicultural Education.* New York. Macmillan.

Spradley, James. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* London: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

News. (2000, March 29). *Triton's Call* (University of Guam's Student Newspaper), p. 2.

Wilhelm, R.W., Cowart, M.F., Hume, L.M., & Rademacher, H. (1996). The effects of a professional development institute on preservice teacher's perception of their intercultural knowledge and sensitivity. *Teacher Education 32*(1), 60-64.

Table 1
Ethnic Groups in Guam: 1920-1990

Ethnicity	1920	1940	1960	1980	1990
Chamorro	12,216 (92%)	20,177 (90.5%)	34,762 (51.9%)	44,299 (41.8%)	49,935 (37.5%)
Filipino	396 (3.0%)	569 (2.6%)	8,580 (12.8%)	22,447 (21.2%)	30,043 (22.6%)
American	280 (2.1%)	785 (3.5%)	20,724 (30.9%)	26,901 (25.4%)	19,160 (14.4%)
Other	383 (2.9%)	759 (3.4%)	2,978 (4.4%)	12,332 (11.6%)	34,014 (25.5%)
Total	13,275(100%)	22,290 (100%)	67,044 (100%)	105,979 (100%)	133,152 (100%)

Source: Schwab, G.J. (1998), *Ethnicities and Masculinities in the Making.*

Table 2
Demographic Information of the Study Participants (Compared to Student Population)

Variables		Sample		Population		Student
Gender:	Female	27	41.50%	77	39.02%	38%
	Male	38	58.50%	121	60.98%	62%
	Total	65	100.00%	198	100.00%	100%
Ethnicity:	Chamorro	15	23.08%	40	20.00%	42.99%
	Filipino	4	6.15%	11	5.37%	32.67%
	Asian	3	4.62%	20	10.24%	7.78%
	Micronesian	1	1.54%	4	1.95%	5.65%
	Other Pacific Islander	1	1.54%	0	0.00%	0.62%
	Caucasian	31	47.69%	115	58.05%	8.27%
	Other	10	15.38%	8	4.39%	2.02%
	Total	65	100.00%	198	100.00%	100.00%
Age (in years):	25 or younger	0	0.0%			
	26 - 35	3	4.6%			
	36 - 45	17	26.2%			
	46 - 55	26	40.0%			
	56 - 65	16	24.6%			
	66 or older	3	4.6%			
	Total	65	100.0%			
Teaching (in years):	5 or less	7	10.8%			
	6 - 10	10	15.4%			
	11 - 15	14	21.5%			
	16 - 20	11	16.9%			
	21 or over	16	24.6%			
	Missing	7	10.8%			
	Total	65	100.0%			
Academic degree:	Associate	1	1.5%			
	Bachelor	1	1.5%			
	Master	14	21.5%			
	Doctorate	49	75.4%			
	Total	65	100.0%			

Table 3
Frequencies and Percentages for Seven teen Questions (N = 65)

Questions	Very Frequently	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Very Seldom
1 How often do you accommodate different viewpoints of your students regardless of their cultural/ethnic background?	34 (52.3%)	27 (41.5%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.1%)
2 How often do you utilize interdisciplinary approaches in teaching?	1 (1.5%)	16 (24.6%)	22 (33.8%)	11 (16.9%)	0(0.0%)
3 How often do you try to get every student involved in a class discussion?	35 (53.8%)	20 (30.8%)	7 (10.8%)	2 (3.1%)	1 (1.5%)
4 How often do you have high expectations for your students regardless of their cultural/ethnic background?	43 (66.2%)	17 (26.2%)	3 (4.6%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)
5 How often do you accommodate different learning styles of your students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background?	27 (41.5%)	23 (35.4%)	13 (20.0%)	0(0.0%)	1 (1.5%)
6 How often do you have a collaborative and collegial partnership with colleagues from the same cultural and ethnic background in your teaching?	17 (26.2%)	20 (30.8%)	11 (16.9%)	7 (10.8%)	9 (13.8%)
7 How often do you use culturally relevant or responsive textbooks in teaching?	19 (29.2%)	19 (29.2%)	12 (18.5%)	5 (7.7%)	9 (13.8%)
8 How often do you encourage students whose second language is English to express themselves in the classroom?	33 (50.8%)	22 (33.8%)	6 (9.2%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (4.6%)
9 How often do you integrate multicultural perspectives in teaching?	34 (52.3%)	19 (29.2%)	7 (10.8%)	4 (6.2%)	1 (1.5%)
10 How often do you support the academic success of your students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background?	52 (80.0%)	11 (16.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	2 (3.1%)
11 How often do you engage in collaborative collegial partnership with colleagues from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds in teaching?	23 (35.4%)	26 (40.0%)	9 (13.8%)	4(6.2%)	2 (3.1%)
12 How often do you listen to your students interactively and attentively regardless of their cultural and ethnic background?	43 (66.2%)	16 (24.6%)	3 (4.6%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.1%)
13 How often do you provide your students with multicultural instructional materials (in class exercises, using videos, films, etc.)?	25 (38.5%)	12 (18.5%)	12 (18.5%)	7 (10.8%)	9(13.8%)
14 How often do you have high expectations for your students regardless of their cultural and ethnic background?	32 (49.2%)	14 (21.5%)	16 (24.6%)	2 (3.1%)	1 (1.5%)
15 How often do you attempt to eradicate prejudice and stereotypes that your students may have?	41 (63.1%)	17 (26.2%)	4 (6.2%)	2 (3.1%)	1 (1.5%)
16 How often do you accommodate cultural/ethnic differences of your students in the classroom?	39 (60.0%)	16 (24.6%)	8 (12.3%)	1 (1.5%)	0(0.0%)
17 How often do you incorporate those cultural/ethnic differences in your teaching methodology?	23 (35.4%)	21 (32.3%)	16 (24.6%)	3 (4.6%)	2 (3.1%)

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Faculty Practice Questions

Item	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum	N
1	4.38	.86	1	5	65
2	4.08	.84	2	5	·62
3	4.32	.90	1	5	65
4	4.54	.79	1	5.	65
5	4.17	.86	1	5	64
6	3.45	1.37	1	5	64
7	3.52	1.40	1	5	64
8	4.25	1.02	1	5	65
9	4.25	.98	1	5	65
10	4.71	.76	1	5	65
11	4.00	1.02	1	5	65
12	4.49	.90	1	5	65
13	3.57	1.45	1	5	65
14	4.14	1.00	1	5	65
15	4.46	.87	1	5	65
16	4.45	.78	1	5	64
17	3.92	1.04	1	5	65

Note: The values represent mean responses to items coded 5 (very frequently), 4 (frequently), 3 (sometimes), 2 (seldom), and 1 (very seldom).

Table 5
Question: "How many times have you done each of the following in the past year?"
Frequencies and Percentages for Questions on Multiculturalism in the Classroom (N = 65)

	11 or more	9-10 times	7-8 times	5-6 times	3-4 times	1-2 times
1 Selection and use of appropriate textbooks	6(9.2%)	5(7.7%)	3(4.6%)	7(10.8%)	12(18.5%)	26(40.0%)
2 Enhancing the syllabus to address diversity and multiculturalism	9(13.8%)	6(9.2%)	6(9.2%)	8(12.3%)	12(18.5%)	20(30.8%)
3 Brainstorming approaches with the students about their needs and wants	8(12.3%)	5(7.7%)	10(15.4%)	13(20.0%)	11(16.8%)	14(21.5%)
4 Open discussion to allow students to share their own views and opinions	38(58.5%)	6(9.2%)	9(13.8%)	6(9.2%)	2(3.1%)	3(4.6%)
5 Inviting other colleagues as guest lecturers to offer the students different perspectives	2(3.1%)	6(9.2%)	5(7.7%)	14(21.5%)	10(15.4%)	26(40.%)
6 Inviting your colleagues to observe your teaching and offer feedback	2(3.1%)	0(0.0%)	2(3.1%)	7(10.8%)	7(10.8%)	44(67.7%)

Table 6
Question: "In what ways do you as a professor expand or enhance your knowledge and awareness about issues of multiculturalism and diversity?"
Frequencies and Percentages for Multicultural Experience Questions

	Frequency/Percentage Female		Frequency/Percentage Male		Frequency/Percentage Total	
Collaborating in teaching with colleagues from cultural backgrounds other than your own	21	32.3	24	36.9	45	69.2
Collaborating in research with colleagues from cultural backgrounds other than your own	20	30.8	28	43.1	48	73.8
Attending lectures, conferences, and workshops on topics that may contribute to your knowledge of other cultures	23	35.4	32	49.2	55	84.6
Using other avenues (television, journals, books, etc.) in search for Knowledge and understanding	24	36.9	33	50.8	57	87.7
By visiting, traveling (that is, exposing oneself to other cultures in Micronesia, the Pacific and Asia)	25	38.5	34	52.3	59	90.8
By associating and learning from people (outside of academia) from cultures and ethnicities other than your own	25	38.5	36	55.4	61	93.8

Table 7
Question: "Do you evaluate attitudes and behaviors of other cultural/ethnic groups from your own cultural/ethnic standards?"
Frequencies and Percentages for the Ethnocentric Practice Question

	Frequency/Percentage		Frequency/Percentage		Frequency/Percentage	
	Female		Male		Total	
Always	1	1.8	0	0.0	1	1.8
Usually	5	8.9	11	19.6	16	28.6
Sometimes	12	21.4	10	17.9	22	39.3
Seldom	4	7.1	7	12.5	11	19.6
Never	2	3.6	4	7.1	6	10.724
Total	24	42.9	32	57.1	56	100.0